

PARTIAL-BIRTH ABORTION BAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, even if President Clinton bows to the pressure of the pro-abortion lobby and vetoes the partial-birth abortion ban, the fact that the Congress, in what will be, as it was previously, a bipartisan vote in support of the ban and the fact that the American people of all political persuasions, men and women of all ages, are beginning, and I mean just beginning, to face the truth and reality about the cruelty of abortion on demand will have made all of this worth the effort.

I chair the subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights. I also am chairman of the Helsinki Commission. I have been in this body now for some 16 years, Madam Speaker. I have always found when we work on human rights issues, it is never easy, whether it be trying to help a Soviet Jew, whether it be trying to help a persecuted Christian in the People's Republic of China, there are always these so-called unwanted people everywhere. Regrettably, the human rights abuse in this country is that which is directed at the most innocent and the most defenseless of all human beings, unborn children. This is the violation of human rights in the United States of America in 1996, the killing of unborn children, 1½ million or so per year on demand, and most of them are for birth control reasons, not the hard cases, life of the mother or even rape and incest. They constitute a very small, infinitesimal number of the abortions. Most of the abortions are done on demand.

Madam Speaker, I believe very strongly that the 22-year coverup of abortion methods, including chemical poisoning of babies is coming to an end. I think most people are beginning to realize, salt solutions are routinely injected into the baby's body, killing that baby, because of the corrosive impact of the salt. And they are appalled.

Another method of abortion, the most commonly procured method, is the dismemberment, D&C suction method, where the baby's body is literally ripped to shreds. We have, because of the leadership of subcommittee Chairman CHARLES CANADY's bill, hopefully, achieved the end of a very gruesome method of abortion, the partial-birth abortion method. This method in recent years has been done increasingly. It is being done in the later terms, in the 6th, 7th, 8th, 9th months of the babies' gestational ages. And, hopefully, even though the President may veto this, this will be the beginning of an effort to outlaw this sickening form of child abuse.

This picture to my left is truly worth a thousand words. It shows what the doctor does, and I just would like to use the doctor who is one of the pioneers of this gruesome method. I will

just very succinctly read his statement as to how this method is done. His name is Dr. Martin Haskell, a doctor who performs partial-birth abortions by the hundreds. He has said, and I quote,

The surgeon takes a pair of blunt, curved Metzenbaum scissors in the right hand. He carefully advances the tip curved down along the spine under his middle finger until he feels contact at the base of the skull under the tip of the middle finger. The surgeon then forces the scissors into the base of the skull. Having safely entered the skull, he spreads the scissors to enlarge the opening. The surgeon then removes the scissors and introduces a suction catheter into this hole and evacuates the skull contents. When the catheter is in place, he applies traction to the fetus, removing it completely from the patient.

What this so-called doctor is describing, Madam Speaker, is infanticide. The baby is partially born, and this so-called doctor then kills the baby in this hideous method. Hopefully, this legislation will get a second shot, not withstanding the President's veto, so we can outlaw this gruesome form of child abuse and banish it from this land.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCINTOSH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. MCINTOSH, addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. BILBRAY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. BILBRAY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SALMON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. SALMON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. SAXTON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

WHY THE ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT SHOULD BE IMPROVED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Madam Speaker, I take this time to bring to the attention of the floor, my col-

leagues, and those that might have the opportunity to hear what I have to say why the Endangered Species Act should be improved. That is the subject of this hour of debate. I will be joined by other Members that were directly involved in trying to improve the Endangered Species Act.

Madam Speaker, I came to this House as a Representative in 1973. Later that same year, I voted, one of the few remaining individuals that voted for the Endangered Species Act of 1973. There were only two hearings on the bill. There was no objection in the committee, and it very nearly passed unanimously on the floor. Those of us who voted for it never dreamed that some day it would be used by this Federal Government, the Government of the people, by the people, and for the people, supposedly, to control vast amounts of privately owned land, that it would be used by extremists to throw thousands of families on to the welfare roll.

The Government has said they want to improve the lot of the people, allowing this bill to be misused. And, Madam Speaker, that is what has happened to the Endangered Species Act. It is a tragedy. It is a law with good intentions, a good goal, but it has been taken to the extremes that the American people no longer support thus endangering the species and why we must improve the act.

This law has resulted in some people losing the right to use their land, their land, not your land, not the Federal Government's, but their land, because an agency, the Fish and Wildlife Service, has ordered them to use their land as a wildlife refuge. These landowners have not been compensated in any way, shape, or form, as our Bill of Rights requires. They still must pay their taxes on this federally controlled land and are singled out unfairly to bear the burden of paying for, supposedly, the public benefit. This has hurt not only the private landholder, the basis of our society, but it has also hurt the wildlife that depend on that land.

Because of the way that these Washington bureaucrats, primarily in the Fish and Wildlife agencies, have treated landowners, and particularly farmers, wildlife is no longer considered an asset by the landowners. Now the presence of wildlife is feared. A lucky few of these landowners have been able to file suit or fight the bureaucrats and extremists in court, a lucky few, those that have extremely great amounts of wealth. However, there are many people who have not been so lucky and have had to suffer the loss of their property or their livelihoods in silence without the tens of thousands of dollars needed to defend their rights in court.

Since I became chairman of the Committee on Resources, I have tried to ensure full and fair public debate on how to protect our endangered species and our threatened species while protecting the private property owner. Our committee held seven field hearings and